STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA COUNTY OF RICHLAND STEPP MANUFACTURING CO. Appellant,)	IN THE CIRCUIT COURT ON APPEAL FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA PROCUREMENT REVIEW PANEL SCPRP Case No. 2005-9
v. SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION)))))	Case No. 2006-CP-40-00432 ORDER
Respondent.)	

This matter came before this Court for a hearing on January 10, 2008, on a Motion to Enforce Order by the Respondent South Carolina Department of Transportation. At the hearing before this Court, Michael Montgomery, Esquire, represented Appellant Stepp Manufacturing, and Amanda Turbeville Taylor, Esquire, represented Respondent.

Respondent made this Motion to Enforce on the basis that Appellant has failed to act on this Court's previous Order issued June 1, 2007, which required Appellant to retrieve defective equipment from Respondent and refund Respondent's purchase price of \$74,575. As of the date of the motion hearing, Appellant had not met either requirement. Respondent requested that the Court allow Respondent to market and sell the subject equipment for a reasonable price pursuant to South Carolina's laws on government surplus property, apply the proceeds of sale to the amount owed by Appellant, file a report and accounting with the Court of the proceeds of sale, and enter a judgment against Appellant for the balance due.



Appellant's attorney stated at the hearing that, although he did not have his client's authority to consent to Respondent's motion, he could not protest the motion because Respondent is clearly entitled to the relief granted by this Court's previous Order.

Based upon the foregoing, the Respondent's Motion to Enforce Order is granted.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

The Honorable G. Thomas (Fifth Judicial Circuit

JANUARY 30, 2008

Columbia, South Carolina

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

COUNTY OF RICHLAND

CASE NO: 2006CP4000432

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

Stepp Manufactoring Co	VS.	South Carolina Department Of Transportation
Plaintiff		Defendant
CHECK ONE:		
☐ JURY VERDICT. This rende		for a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and a verdict
☐ DECISION BY THE COURT	This action came to tria and a decision rendered	l or hearing before the court. The issues have been thed or heard
ACTION DISMISSED (CHEC	K REASON):	
SCRCP (Vol. Nonsuit);	Rule 43(k), SCRCP (Sett	led); ☐ Other: ☐ Rule 40(j) SCRCP; ☐ Bankruptcy: ᠘
☐ ACTION STRICKEN (<u>CHEC</u>	K REASON):	☐ Rule 40(j) SCRCP; ☐ Bankruptcy: ᠘
☐ Binding arbitration, subject to☐ Other:		vacate or modify arbitration award;
IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED:		
Dated at Columbia, S	South Carolina, this	day of, 2008.
	PRES	IDING JUDGE
This judgment was entered on the	day of day of	, 2008, and a copy mailed first class this ord or to parties (when appearing pro se) as follows:
Michael H. Montgomery		Ester Ferguson Haymond Keith C McCook Amanda Turbeville Taylor
ATTORNEY(S) FOR THE PLAINTIFF	(S)	ATTORNEY(S) FOR THE DEFENDANT(S)
		S/BARBARA A. SCOTT
SCRCP APP-24/FORM 4		Clerk of Court